

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Applicant notes that claims 1, 4 and 7 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-4 are pending in the application.

Drawings:

In the Office Action, the Figure 4 was objected to because reference numeral 38 is used to designate both input/output and time base. Applicant has submitted herewith a proposed drawing correction that clarifies that reference numeral 38 designates input/output. In view of the foregoing amendment, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claim Objections:

In the Office Action, claim 3 was objected to for being in improper multiple dependent form. Applicant has amended claim 3 to remove the multiple dependencies and clarify that claim 3 is an independent claim. Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendment, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 3 be withdrawn.

Section 102 Rejections:

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reiner (US Patent No. 5,995,629).

With regard to independent claim 1, Applicant notes that this claim has been amended to more particularly recite that the integrated circuit (10) is controlled in such a manner that the execution of actual arithmetic operations on the one hand and dummy data input/output operations (38) or dummy data transfers (40) from one register to another or between registers (30, 32) on the other hand are executed in parallel in time. In contrast, Reiner generally describes an encoding device that performs dummy encoding operations in an encoding unit VE during such time that data shifting operations are performed in an output register AR. Applicant, accordingly, respectfully submits that Reiner only executes dummy arithmetic operations and actual data shifting operations in parallel, not executing actual arithmetic operations on the one hand and dummy data input/output operations (38) or dummy data transfers (40) from one register to another or between registers (30, 32) on the other hand in parallel as recited in claim 1. Embodiments of claim 1 provide certain advantages over Reiner by disguising power consumption during actual arithmetic operations, which Reiner does not address. Therefore,

because Reiner fails to teach or suggest claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102 rejection with respect to claim 1 be withdrawn.

Section 103 Rejections:

In the Office Action, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Reiner in view of Malek (US Patent No. 5,086,467). Applicant notes that the deficiencies of claim 1 were discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the addition of Malek fails to alleviate these deficiencies. In particular, Malek generally describes a repeater that generates dummy traffic during such time that the repeater is not transmitting or receiving data in order to artificially increase the amount of traffic on the channel and thereby forestall cryptanalytic attack by traffic analysis. Applicant, accordingly, respectfully submits that Malek fails to teach or suggest the features recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103(a) rejection with respect to claim 2 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4 are in condition for allowance. Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests that a notice of allowance be issued with respect to claims 1-4.

Please charge any fees which may be required, except the issue fee, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Date: April 5, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By Kevin Simons
Kevin Simons, Reg. No. 45,110
(408) 474-9075
Philips Electronics North America
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131 USA